



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

be settled by a hard-and-fast system, laid down in consequence of historical precedents, and in such a way that it may command the attention and respect of the practical people in the world. And with that remark, and a single illustration, I will not try to hold your attention any longer.

It is to be observed that the passion for war is not a passion of the men who create the wealth of the world, or who are the really important people in the work of the world. Merchants never want to make war, the men who pass from country to country never want to make war, scholars never want to make war, inventors never want to make war. War checks the real progress of the world in invention, manufacture, trade; and all these demands for war which Mr. Abbott alluded to this morning are superficial. The real workers and thinkers are always opposed to war. It is the loafers, the people who wait for something to turn up, those who think they shall like to enlist in the armies,—the people who are supposed to make public opinion, but who really follow public opinion,—who make wars popular at the beginning. And it is the steady dislike of people to being killed and to having their brothers killed, to spending money in taxes, to having their ships taken at sea, which always makes war unpopular when war comes to an end. We may be quite sure that if we can propose a practical system which will commend itself to practical men we shall go into any discussion of the subject with a good working force behind us.

THE TREATY OF ARBITRATION BETWEEN GREAT BRITAIN AND THE UNITED STATES.

BY HON. ROBERT TREAT PAINE.

An address given at the Conference on International Arbitration at Lake Mohonk, N. Y., June 6, 1895.

The movement we are interested in needs only to be fully appreciated by ourselves to succeed. The hardest fighter that we ever had on this continent, when he said, "Let us have peace," struck a chord that has not ceased to vibrate.

This matter of the treaty of arbitration between Great Britain and the United States does not differ very widely from the subject that we considered last evening. A treaty is the first step, and an international court of arbitration that shall include all nations of the world is the last step; we have not necessarily to take the last step first. Why may we not have a high court of arbitration that shall be sanctioned by a treaty between two nations, or three, or several, and at last include all? A treaty between two nations is perhaps the simplest step; and the most important treaty, if we may say so, that can be enacted is that between the two great English-speaking nations, the United States and Great Britain. Is that hopeless? I think a brief statement of facts will show us that we are

on the very eve of accomplishing this superb achievement.

This cause has proceeded by triennial steps. I have here a brief history, prepared by the secretary of the American Peace Society, Dr. Trueblood, who has put such splendid work into this cause for the last three years. It is a history of the movement for an arbitration treaty between Great Britain and the United States. I think we may say that it began in 1887, when a deputation of thirteen Englishmen brought over a memorial, signed by two hundred and thirty-three members of the British House of Commons, presented it to the President, and were received by him most cordially. Let me read a few words. The memorial asked for "a treaty which shall stipulate that any differences or disputes arising between the two governments, which cannot be adjusted by diplomatic agency, shall be referred to arbitration. Should such a proposal happily emanate from the Congress of the United States, our best influence shall be used to ensure its acceptance by the government of Great Britain." President Cleveland made a kind response, promising to give the matter his "faithful and careful consideration."

The next important step forward was taken on the 3d of April, 1890, when the Sherman Concurrent Resolution was passed unanimously by our House of Representatives; a brief but important resolve:

"Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), that the President be, and is hereby requested, to invite from time to time as fit occasion may arise, negotiations with any government with which the United States may have diplomatic relations, to the end that any differences or disputes arising between the governments, which cannot be adjusted by diplomatic agency, may be referred to arbitration."

Now you will remember that just at that time the Pan-American Congress had been meeting at Washington, summoned by our government from all the republics of this continent. Let me read a few words spoken when that congress was called together, in the welcome extended to them by Mr. Blaine. This was on the 3d of October, 1889. These are official words, spoken by our Secretary of State, welcoming officially the delegates from the countries of this continent:

"The delegates whom I am addressing can do much to establish permanent relations of confidence, respect and friendship between the nations which they represent. They can show to the world an honorable and peaceful conference of seventeen independent American powers, in which all shall meet together on terms of absolute equality;—a conference in which there can be no attempt to coerce a single delegate against his own conception of the interests of his nation; a conference which will permit no secret understanding on any subject, but will frankly publish to the world all its conclusions; a conference which will tolerate no spirit of conquest, but will aim to cultivate an American sympathy, as broad as both continents; a conference which will form no selfish alliance against the older nations from which we are proud to claim inheritance; a conference, in fine, which will seek nothing, propose

nothing, endure nothing, that is not, in the general sense of all the delegates, timely and wise and peaceful."

And a few words towards the end of Mr. Blaine's welcome:

"It will be a greater gain when we shall be able to draw the people of all American nations into closer acquaintance with each other,—an end to be facilitated by more frequent and more rapid inter-communication. It will be the greatest gain when the personal and commercial relations of the American States, south and north, shall be so developed and so regulated that each shall acquire the highest possible advantage from the enlightened and enlarged intercourse of all."

You will remember that as a result of that Pan-American Congress, a brief draft of a treaty of arbitration was prepared, to be signed by the delegates of those countries, and was signed by almost all. Unfortunately it had a time limit, which required that it be ratified by the home governments on or before a given date, which came too soon, so that no accomplished treaty has grown out of that proposal. Many of our friends in Europe think that the first draft signed at Washington was final and definite, but it was not.

Immediately after the adjournment of the Pan-American Conference, and acting upon the resolve passed unanimously by our House of Representatives, a circular letter was addressed by our State Department, over the signature of Mr. Blaine, to the various countries with whom we have diplomatic relations, intimating that the United States was ready to negotiate treaties of arbitration. This was another very important step forward.

Large powers move slowly; England did not act until after a lapse of over a year, when the friends of peace in the House of Commons made a strenuous attempt. The 16th of June, 1893, was a great day in our cause. Mr. Cremer and other friends of the arbitration cause had their motion heard in the House of Commons. Mr. Gladstone took part in the discussion, improved the resolution by an amendment which he himself offered; and after a debate, in which he made a powerful speech,—he being then prime minister,—and Sir John Lubbock and other leading Englishmen spoke, and after devoting a good part of the session to speeches in favor of the motion, this resolution was passed, "without a division," that is, unanimously:

"That this House has learned with satisfaction that both houses of the United States Congress have authorized the President to invite from time to time, as fit occasion may arise, negotiations with any government with which the United States has or may have diplomatic relations, to the end that any differences or disputes arising between the two governments, which cannot be adjusted by diplomatic agencies, may be referred to arbitration, and peaceably adjusted by such means.

"That this House cordially sympathizing with the purpose in view, expresses the hope that Her Majesty's government will lend their ready co-operation to the government of the United States upon the basis of the foregoing resolution."

Mr. Bayard, then our ambassador, in communicating this action of the House of Commons, said that this "was entirely above the usual range of parliamentary expression." The Earl of Rosebery, Secretary of State, sent the following letter, in July, 1893, to Sir Julian Pauncefote, the British ambassador at Washington:

"I transmit to Your Excellency copy of a resolution which was passed in the House of Commons on the 16th ult., expressing sympathy with the action taken by the Congress of the United States in favor of the settlement of international disputes by arbitration.

"Her Majesty's government have pleasure in bringing this resolution to the knowledge of the government of the United States, and would be glad if the President should see fit to lay it before both Houses of Congress.

"I request that Your Excellency will communicate a copy of this resolution to the Secretary of State, with an intimation to the above effect."

In the autumn of that year, our American Peace Society at Boston deemed it important to secure the next step forward if possible, and at their request I visited Washington in November, and had a very satisfactory interview with Mr. Gresham, the Secretary of State. I strongly urged him to secure some favorable mention of this matter in the President's message. The message which appeared shortly afterward, in December, 1893, had this clause in it:

"It affords me signal pleasure to lay this Parliamentary resolution before Congress, and to express my sincere gratification that the sentiment of two great and kindred nations is thus authoritatively manifested in favor of the rational and peaceful settlement of international quarrels by honorable resort to arbitration."

I think we must admit that this was the culmination of the movement thus far. I said that we had advanced by triennial steps; perhaps we must be patient, and be well content if in 1896 the thing can be done. At any rate, much progress has been made since.

The question for us to consider this morning is, What is the next action that should be taken? It would seem that the next thing is for our executive department to negotiate the desired treaty. But it has been supposed by some of our friends that it would be wise to have Congress again invite our executive to act. Resolutions to that effect were introduced in the House of Representatives and in the Senate in the spring of 1894, about a year ago, and were under consideration during that session.

When Dr. Trueblood and I visited Washington at the beginning of the last session, in December, we found conditions somewhat unfavorable in the House of Representatives. Just then the disagreement existed with Great Britain about the Mosquito territory, and the proposal to complete the Nicaraguan Canal was also deemed of great importance in Washington. Senator Morgan, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, was making a great speech in behalf of this canal. It was supposed

that the Clayton Bulwer treaty with Great Britain might operate to prevent the United States doing what some enterprising commercial men wish to have done by our government; and there is a certain feeling among members of the House of Representatives that until we get what we wish in regard to this canal, by England's consent or in spite of her, we do not wish to tie our hands with a treaty which might compel us to submit any disagreement to impartial arbitration. The matter had come up, therefore, before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs; it had been referred to a sub-committee; but though Dr. William Everett of Massachusetts, as chairman of that committee, had done everything he could to secure a favorable report, he had failed. We consulted with members of the Senate committee on Foreign Affairs, and on the whole they deemed it wise that the resolve should not be acted upon in the Senate; because, after the Executive negotiates a treaty, it then becomes the constitutional duty of the Senate to consider, act upon, and either accept or reject the treaty.

So we went back to the executive department, and had a brief but satisfactory interview with Mr. Gresham, who was very friendly to the cause in all the interviews we had with him;—I delight to do him this honor. Just at that time he was pre-occupied with other important business, and so the arbitration treaty waits for an opportune moment.

We do not want to underestimate the strength of our cause. I do not think there is the slightest reason for discouragement; great events come slowly. We need to appreciate what I was about to call the almost unanimous sentiment of this country in favor of this movement. The fact that a resolve like this passed unanimously in our House of Representatives, that it was passed without division in the House of Commons of Great Britain, shows that when the fit moment comes the treaty will be made.

I am delighted to think that we meet here to do what we can, in wise counsel, to expedite further this great cause which will unite the two great English-speaking nations in perpetual peace and amity. It will be an object-lesson to the rest of the world, and a very powerful step in the progress towards disarmament among the nations of Europe.

Just one word further about the relations that have existed between Great Britain and the United States, on a very important portion of the world's surface. It is not much known; it is one of those great things which have almost passed into oblivion because it has done its perfect work. How many of us know the fact that in 1817, after the war with Great Britain, the United States negotiated a short treaty, of about one page, which provided that on the chain of the Great Lakes, stretching so far across this continent, neither power should at any time have any vessel of war? Till the present time, nearly eighty years, the treaty has been faithfully observed, and the result is

that there are no fortresses, no preparations for war, by land or water, on that whole territory. We came very near to the abrogation of that treaty during our Civil War, but fortunately the notice that had been given by our government to Great Britain was withdrawn and rescinded, and the treaty stands. This illustration shows how efficacious is a wise step in the right direction.

How can we make our influence effective? I cannot refrain from saying how greatly encouraged I am when I see the men and women in this gathering, and feel, what we all must feel, that it is not a little local cause, that we are not isolated units struggling at a hopeless cause, but that we are united and resolute in behalf of a cause which is sure to win. Shall we not go home cheered and confident? We have the press with us; of course we know that the pulpit is on our side. It only needs determination among ourselves to secure the result which we have at heart to accomplish.

A BUSINESS MAN'S VIEW OF ARBITRATION.

BY JOSHUA L. BAILY.

Address given at the Mohonk Arbitration Conference, June 5th.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen—Those who are engaged in commercial pursuits have especial occasion to notice how the barriers by which nations were once hedged in are being gradually removed. Not only are the natural barriers overcome by the spanning of rivers and the tunnelling of mountains, but the restrictions upon intercourse have been much abated. Passports are not so necessary as once they were. Our international postal system has contributed much towards a unification of interests, as have also the railways which interlace and bind whole continents with their net-work of steel. Electricity too has brought the nations into such close and instant communication that time and distance are well nigh annihilated and those who were one time far separated, have become near neighbors. There has been established a close community of interest and sympathy which could not permit of war between any two of the nations without most disastrous results to all.

Again it seems to me that the reference of national differences to some tribunal other than war is inevitable because of the frightful cost involved. I have somewhere seen it stated that fully one-third of all the revenues of the nations of Europe is required to pay the interest on their national debts, contracted, as you know, chiefly for war purposes; another third of the revenues goes to keep up the armies and navies on the present war footing, while only one-third remains for the civic administration and all other objects of government. Think of it! Two-thirds of all the revenues of the nations of Europe to meet the obligations of war, and only one-third for all other purposes whatever! And instead of diminishing, this sorrowful disproportion is increasing. To-day the standing armies of Europe number more than four millions (4,000,000) of men, not counting other millions of reserves. The number has nearly doubled in the last twenty years, and the national debts, incurred chiefly